# UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF INDIANA HAMMOND DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	)	
	)	
V.	)	
	)	CASE NO. 2:07 CR 130 PS
MARIA OLIMPO	)	
	)	
	)	

# **COURT'S FINAL JURY INSTRUCTIONS**

Dated: June 18, 2008

s/ Philip P. Simon

PHILIP P. SIMON, JUDGE

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

Members of the jury, you have seen and heard all the evidence and arguments of the attorneys. Now I will instruct you on the law.

You have two duties as a jury, your first duty is to decide the facts from the evidence in the case. This is your job, and yours alone.

Your second duty is to apply the law that I give you to the facts. You must follow these instructions, even if you disagree with them. Each of the instructions is important, and you must follow all of them.

Perform these duties fairly and impartially. Do not allow sympathy, prejudice, fear, or public opinion to influence you. You should not be influenced by any person's race, color, religion, national ancestry, or sex.

Nothing I say now, and nothing I said or did during the trial, is meant to indicate any opinion on my part on what the facts are or what your verdict should be.

The evidence consists of the testimony of the witnesses and the exhibits admitted in evidence.

You are to decide whether the testimony of each of the witnesses is truthful and accurate, in part, in whole, or not at all, as well as what weight, if any, you give to the testimony of each witness.

In evaluating the testimony of any witness, you may consider, among other things:

- the witness's age;
- the witness's intelligence;
- the ability and opportunity the witness had to see, hear, or know the things that the witness testified about;
  - the witness's memory;
  - any interest, bias, or prejudice the witness may have;
  - the manner of the witness while testifying; and
  - the reasonableness of the witness's testimony in light of all the evidence in the case.

You should judge the defendant's testimony in the same way that you judge the testimony of any other witness.

You should use common sense in weighing the evidence and consider the evidence in light of your own observations in life.

In our lives, we often look at one fact and conclude from it that another fact exists. In law we call this "inference." A jury is allowed to make reasonable inferences. Any inferences you make must be reasonable and must be based on the evidence in the case.

Some of you have heard the phrases "circumstantial evidence" and "direct evidence." Direct evidence is the testimony of someone who claims to have personal knowledge of the commission of the crime which has been charged, such as an eyewitness. Circumstantial evidence is the proof of a series of facts which tend to show whether the defendant is guilty or not guilty. The law makes no distinction between the weight to be given either direct or circumstantial evidence. You should decide how much weight to give to any evidence. All the evidence in the case, including the circumstantial evidence, should be considered by you in reaching your verdict.

Certain things are not evidence. I will list them for you:

First, anything that you may have seen or heard outside the courtroom is not evidence and must be entirely disregarded.

Second, questions and objections by the lawyers are not evidence. Attorneys have a duty to object when they believe a question is improper. You should not be influenced by any objection or by my ruling on it.

Third, the lawyers' statements to you are not evidence. The purpose of these statements is to discuss the issues and the evidence. If the evidence as you remember it differs from what the lawyers said, your memory is what counts.

It is proper for an attorney to interview any witness in preparation for trial.

The indictment in this case is the formal method of accusing the defendant of an offense and placing the defendant on trial. It is not evidence against the defendant and does not create any inference of guilt.

The defendant, Maria Olimpo, is charged with the offense of distribution of cocaine. The defendant has pleaded not guilty to the charge.

The defendant is presumed to be innocent of each of the charge. This presumption continues during every stage of the trial and your deliberations on the verdict. It is not overcome unless from all the evidence in the case you are convinced beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant is guilty as charged. The government has the burden of proving the guilt of the defendant beyond a reasonable doubt.

This burden of proof stays with the government throughout the case. The defendant is never required to prove her innocence or to produce any evidence at all.

You have received evidence of a statement said to be made by the defendant. You must decide whether the defendant did in fact make the statement. If you find that the defendant did make the statement, then you must decide what weight, if any, you feel the statement deserves. In making this decision, you should consider all matters in evidence having to do with the statement, including those concerning the defendant herself and the circumstances under which the statement was made.

You have heard a witness give opinions about matters requiring special knowledge or skill. You should judge this testimony in the same way that you judge the testimony of any other witness. The fact that such a person has given an opinion does not mean that you are required to accept it. Give the testimony whatever weight you think it deserves, considering the reasons given for the opinion, the witness's qualifications, and all of the other evidence in the case.

You have heard testimony of an identification of a person. Identification testimony is an expression of belief or impression by the witness. You should consider whether, or to what extent, the witness had the ability and the opportunity to observe the person at the time of the offense and to make a reliable identification later. You should also consider the circumstances under which the witness later made the identification.

The government has the burden of proving beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant was the person who committed the crime charged.

You have heard evidence that, before the trial, witnesses made statements that may be inconsistent with the witnesses' testimony here in court. If you find that it is inconsistent, you may consider the earlier statement only in deciding the truthfulness and accuracy of that witness's testimony in this trial. You may not use it as evidence of the truth of the matters contained in that prior statement. If that statement was made under oath, you may also consider it as evidence of the truth of the matters contained in that prior statement.

A statement made by a defendant before trial that is inconsistent with the defendant's testimony here in court may be used by you as evidence of the truth of the matters contained in it, and also in deciding the truthfulness and accuracy of that defendant's testimony in this trial.

You have heard evidence that Ronald Johnson and Thomas Reed have each been convicted of a crime. You may consider this evidence only in deciding whether Mr. Johnson's and/or Mr. Reed's testimony is truthful in whole, in part, or not at all. You may not consider this evidence for any other purpose.

You have heard testimony from Ronald Johnson who:

- (a) received benefits from the government in connection with this case; and
- (b) has pleaded guilty to an offense arising out of the same occurrences for which the Defendant is now on trial. Mr. Johnson's guilty plea is not to be considered as evidence against the defendant.

You may give this testimony such weight as you feel it deserves, keeping in mind that it must be considered with caution and great care.

You have heard recorded conversations. These recorded conversations are proper evidence and you may consider them, just as any other evidence.

When the recordings were played during the trial, you were furnished transcripts of the recorded conversations.

The recordings are the evidence, and the transcripts were provided to you only as a guide to help you follow as you listen to the recordings. The transcripts are not evidence of what was actually said or who said it. It is up to you to decide whether the transcripts correctly reflect what was said and who said it. If you noticed any difference between what you heard on the recordings and what you read in the transcripts, you must rely on what you heard, not what you read. And if after careful listening, you could not hear or understand certain parts of the recordings, you must ignore the transcripts as far as those parts are concerned.

You are not required to replay the recordings, in part or in whole. You may rely, instead, on you recollections of these recordings as you heard them at trial. If you do decide to listen to or watch a recording and wish to have any of the transcripts corresponding to that recording, ask the Marshal in writing. You may choose to listen to or watch the recording without the transcript.

The indictment charges that the offense was committed "on or about" August 31, 2006. The government must prove that the offense happened reasonably close to that date but is not required to prove that the alleged offense happened on that exact date.

When the word "knowingly" is used in these instructions, it means that the defendant realized what she was doing and was aware of the nature of her conduct, and did not act through ignorance, mistake or accident. Knowledge may be proved by the defendant's conduct, and by all the facts and circumstances surrounding the case.

An offense may be committed by more than one person. A defendant's guilt may be established without proof that the defendant personally performed every act constituting the crime charged.

Any person who knowingly aids the commission of an offense may be found guilty of that offense. That person must knowingly associate with the criminal activity, participate in the activity, and try to make it succeed.

If a defendant knowingly caused the acts of another, the defendant is responsible for those acts as though she personally committed them.

To sustain the charge of distributing cocaine, the government must prove the following propositions:

First, the defendant distributed cocaine;

Second, the defendant did so knowingly or intentionally; and,

Third, the defendant knew the substance was a controlled substance.

If you find from your consideration of all the evidence that each of these propositions has been proved beyond a reasonable doubt, then you should find the defendant guilty.

If, on the other hand, you find from your consideration of all the evidence that any of these propositions has not been proved beyond a reasonable doubt, then you should find the defendant not guilty.

Distribution is the transfer or attempted transfer of possession from one person to another.

It is sufficient that the defendant knew that the substance was some kind of prohibited drug. It does not matter whether the defendant knew that the substance was cocaine.

You are instructed that cocaine is a controlled substance.

Upon retiring to the jury room, select one of your number as your foreperson. The foreperson will preside over your deliberations and will be your representative here in court.

Forms of verdict have been prepared for you.

Take these forms to the jury room, and when you have reached unanimous agreement on the verdict, your foreperson will fill in and date the appropriate form, and each of you will sign it.

I do not anticipate that you will need to communicate with me. If you do, however, the only proper way is in writing, signed by the foreperson, or if he or she is unwilling to do so, by some other juror, and given to the marshal.

The verdict must represent the considered judgment of each juror. Your verdict, whether it be guilty or not guilty, must be unanimous.

You should make every reasonable effort to reach a verdict. In doing so, you should consult with one another, express your own views, and listen to the opinions of your fellow jurors. Discuss your differences with an open mind. Do not hesitate to re-examine your own views and change your opinion if you come to believe it is wrong. But you should not surrender your honest beliefs about the weight or effect of evidence solely because of the opinions of your fellow jurors or for the purpose of returning a unanimous verdict.

The twelve of you should give fair and equal consideration to all the evidence and deliberate with the goal of reaching an agreement which is consistent with the individual judgment of each juror.

You are impartial judges of the facts. Your sole interest is to determine whether the government has proved its case beyond a reasonable doubt.